

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
GEORGE T. MARCOU
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 FOURTEENTH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

RECEIVED
SEP 9 2004

Atty: *GM*
Docket/Matter No.: *SAIC0067-U*
Action: *IDS*
Due: *12/7/04*
CU: *11/7; 12/1/04*

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference SAIC0067-PCT		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 07 SEP 2004 REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US03/21691	International filing date (day/month/year) 11 July 2003 (11.07.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 30 September 2002 (30.09.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): H04Q 7/00 and US Cl.: 370/328		
Applicant SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☒ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 30 January 2005 (30.01.2005).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Kwang B. Yao Telephone No. 571-272-2000
---	--

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

Atty: *GM*
Docket/Matter No.: *SAIC0067-PCT*
Action: *RESP to EPO*
Due: *11/7/04*
CU: *10/7; 10/31/04*

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/21691

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation (Form PCT/IPEA/405) to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:

- ☒ restricted the claims.
☐ paid additional fees.
☐ paid additional fees under protest.
☐ neither restricted nor paid additional fees.

2. This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with for the following reasons and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees:

3. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this opinion:

- ☐ all parts.
☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-11, 21-32.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/21691

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>8-11, 22, 27-32</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-7, 21, 23-26</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>8, 22, 27-29</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-7, 9-11, 21, 23-26, 30-32</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-11, 21-32</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Please See Continuation Sheet

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1-7, 21, 23-26 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Cook et al. (US 6,052,558).

Cook et al. discloses a networked repeater comprising the following features: as depicted in Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, at least one designated area; one base station (22) associated with each of the at least one designated area, wherein the base station (22) provides wireless communication to a plurality of user equipments UEs (24) wishing to access the network by transmitting downlink signals to the UEs (24); and a repeater (50) associated with the base station (22), wherein the repeater (50) captures the downlink signals sent by the base station (22) to the UEs (24), wherein the repeater (50) is capable of discriminately selecting one of the captured downlink signals sent to a selected one of the UEs (24) and amplifying (92, 116) and transmitting the selected downlink signal; regarding claim 2, wherein the repeater (50) transmits the amplified selected signals in-band to the selected UE; regarding claim 3, wherein the selected downlink signal includes both data and control information (Fig. 6, column 9, lines 41 to column 10, line 9); regarding claim 4, wherein the repeater (50) is capable of capturing uplink signals from the UEs (24) to the base station (22), discriminately selecting one of the uplink signals, and amplifying (92, 116) and transmitting the selected uplink signal; regarding claim 5, wherein the selected uplink signal includes both data and control information (Fig. 6, column 9, lines 41 to column 10, line 9); regarding claim 6, wherein the repeater (50) is capable of capturing all uplink signals from the UEs (24) to the base station (22) and indiscriminately amplifying (92, 116) and transmitting all the uplink signals; regarding claim 7, wherein the repeater (50) is also capable of indiscriminately amplifying (92, 116) and transmitting all the downlink signals; regarding claim 21, receiving a first RF signal; processing the first RF signal to discern data channels from control channels (Fig. 6, column 9, lines 41 to column 10, line 9); selecting one of the data channels based on predetermined criteria (Fig. 6, column 9, lines 41 to column 10, line 9); amplifying (92, 116) and converting the selected data channel into a first output RF signal; and transmitting the first output RF signal in-band; regarding claim 23, wherein the first RF signal is intended for one or more subscriber units (24) in a wireless communication network; regarding claim 24, wherein the first RF signal is intended for a base station (22) in a wireless communication network; regarding claim 25, receiving a second RF signal intended for a base station (22) in the wireless communication network; processing the second RF signal to discern data channels from control channels; amplifying (92, 116) and converting all the data channels from the second RF signal into a second output RF signal; and transmitting the second out RF signal; regarding claim 26, receiving a second RF signal intended for one or more subscriber units (24) in the wireless communication network; processing the second RF signal to discern data channels from control channels (Fig. 6, column 9, lines 41 to column 10, line 9); amplifying (92, 116) and converting all the data channels from the second RF signal into a second output RF signal; and transmitting the second out RF signal. See column 2-12.

Claims 9, 10, 30, 31 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Cook et al. (US 6,052,558) in view of Raleigh et al. (US 6,101,399).

Cook et al. discloses the claimed limitations above. Cook et al. does not disclose the following features: regarding claims 9, wherein the repeater comprises an equalization filter to compensate for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No. _____

PCT/US03/21691

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-26 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 27-34 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-11 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☒ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

between the repeater and the base station; regarding claim 10, wherein the equalization filter is an adaptive equalization filter; regarding claim 30, compensating for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths to the one or more subscriber units; regarding claim 31, compensating for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths to the base station. Raleigh et al. discloses a communication system comprising the following features: : regarding claims 9, wherein the repeater comprises an equalization filter to compensate for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths between the repeater and the base station; regarding claim 10, wherein the equalization filter is an adaptive equalization filter; regarding claim 30, compensating for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths to the one or more subscriber units; regarding claim 31, compensating for interference caused by an existence of multiple communication paths to the base station. See column 23, lines 22-26 and 49-57. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Cook et al., by using the features, as taught by Raleigh et al., in order to provide less interference delivered to the undesired users. See Raleigh et al., column 12, lines 13-16.

Claims 11 and 32 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Cook et al. (US 6,052,558) in view of Jeon (US 6,097,928).

Cook et al. discloses the claimed limitations above. Cook et al. does not disclose the following features: regarding claim 11, wherein the repeater comprises a phase locked loop for matching a carrier frequency of the transmitted selected downlink signal with a carrier frequency of the selected downlink signal as it is originally transmitted by the base station to a tolerance acceptable to the UE; regarding claim 32, matching a carrier frequency of the first output RF signal and a carrier frequency of the first RF signal to an accepted tolerance. Jeon discloses a communication system comprising the following features: regarding claim 11, wherein the repeater comprises a phase locked loop for matching a carrier frequency of the transmitted selected downlink signal with a carrier frequency of the selected downlink signal as it is originally transmitted by the base station to a tolerance acceptable to the UE; regarding claim 32, matching a carrier frequency of the first output RF signal and a carrier frequency of the first RF signal to an accepted tolerance. See column 1, lines 23-37; column 2, lines 30-40. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Cook et al., by using the features, as taught by Jeon, in order to provide an improvement on the efficiency of the control channels. See Jeon, column 3, lines 26-48.

Claims 8, 22, 27-29 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a communication system comprising the following features: regarding claim 8, wherein the selected UE can tolerate a predetermined time delay between the time that the selected downlink signal is transmitted by the base station and the time the selected downlink signal is amplified and transmitted by the repeater; and wherein the repeater is capable of selecting, amplifying, and transmitting the selected downlink signal within the predetermined time delay; regarding claim 22, wherein the control channels include pilot, sync, and paging channels; regarding claim 27, determining a tolerance for time delay of the transmitted RF signals; and insuring that the processing, selecting, and converting steps are within the tolerance for time delay; regarding claim 28, wherein the received RF signals are intended for a plurality of subscriber units, and the tolerance for time delay comprises an allowable time delay for one of the subscriber unit to accommodate diversity combining of data channels; regarding claim 29, wherein the insuring step includes setting a software parameter in a wireless network that includes the subscriber units for a time delay search window around one of the control channel time references.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 6,052,558 A (COOK et al) 18 April 2000, see column 2-12.

US 6,101,399 A (RALEIGH et al) 8 August 2000, see column 23, lines 22-26, 49-57.

US 6,097,928 A (JEON) 1 August 2000, see column 1, lines 23-27; column 2, lines 33-40.